UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Duty to Civilization (*Part VI*)

By FRANCIS NEILSON

Richard Wagner

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

Justice in the United States

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

An Open Letter to a Slacker

By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 17

Chicago, June 23, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 259
Duty to Civilization. VI.—Francis Neilson 262

CONTRIBUTED—
Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. V. Richard Wagner.—George Willis Cooke 266
Justice in the United States.—John Haynes Holmes . . 268

SELECTED—
Georgia Saves Her Reputation.—*Esau Jones* 269

POETRY—
Destiny.—*John Burroughs* 259
Dusk.—*Anonymous* 265
Poem.—*John Oxenham* 269

CORRESPONDENCE—
An Open Letter to a Slacker.—Brent Dow Allinson . . 270
Pacifism.—Carlyle Summerbell 271

THE FIELD—
A Free Church 271

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 1921 NUMBER 17

DESTINY.

Serene I fold my hands and wait,
Nor care for wind, nor tide, nor sea,
I rave no more 'gainst time or fate,
For lo! my own shall come to me.

I stay my haste, I make delays,
For what avails this eager pace?
I stand amid the eternal ways,
And what is mine shall know my face.

Asleep, awake, by night or day,
The friends I seek are seeking me;
No wind can drive my bark astray,
Nor change the tide of destiny.

What matter if I stand alone?
I wait with joy the coming years;
My heart shall reap where it is sown,
And gather up its fruit of tears.

The stars come nightly to the sky;
The tidal wave comes to the sea;
Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high,
Can keep my own away from me.

—*John Burroughs.*

Secretary of War Weeks tells us that "under present conditions it would be the height of folly for the United States to be the first to disarm. . . . Prudence would not permit us disarming while others held weapons in their hands." If we were Englishmen, as we are Americans, we would be hearing some English Weeks telling his fellow-citizens that under present conditions it would be the height of folly for Great Britain to be the first to disarm. If we were Frenchmen, we would hear some French Weeks feverishly arguing that under present conditions it would be the height of folly for France to be the first to disarm. If we were Japanese, we would hear some Weeks of the Celestial Empire declaring at a university commencement that under present conditions it would be the height of folly for Japan to be the first to disarm. If we were a Fiji Islander, we would hear some naked Fiji Weeks, arrayed in war paint and feathers, shouting at a war dance of his fellow warriors that under present conditions it would be the height of folly for the Fiji Islands to be the first to disarm. Thus round and round the unbroken circle of platitude and superstition, the so-called wise men of the tribes of earth talk about the necessity of preparedness, and prate the old lie that preparedness prevents war and secures peace! So long as this parrot talk goes on, it is of course hopeless to talk about international order and good will, or to hope for the saving of our civilization. Some break in the vicious circle has got to be made; and yet every nation is waiting upon the initiative of some other nation, and blaming this other nation for not leading the way! For ourselves, we are convinced, the more we ponder the situation, that nothing can ever bring about disarmament and peace on earth excepting some dramatic action of humility and sacrifice, which will catch the imagination of the world and shame the nations into "leaving all and following"! Of course, disarmament must in the end be universal, in order to be effective; but in the beginning, it must come by some people's grounding arms and challenging the rest of mankind to go and do likewise.

The American Union Against Militarism, in reporting the action of the United States Senate on the Naval Bill now in conference, tests the sentiments of the various Senators on the disarmament question by recording their votes on the provision for a $1,500,000 naval base at Alameda, California, on the proposed increase of $1,000,000, in the appropriation for transportation and recruiting, on the proposed increase in personnel, on the proposed cut of $100,000,000, and on the final passage of the whole measure. The Union declares that a perfect score on these test votes would be "No" on the first three, "Yes" on the fourth, and "No" on the last. The Senators who had this perfect score are Capper (Kans.), Harris (Ga.), Heflin (Ala.), Hitchcock (Neb.), King (Utah), LaFollette (Wis.), Sheppard (Texas), Stanley (Ky.), and Watson (Ga.). Senator Borah does not appear in this list because he voted for the bill on final passage, pleading that he desired to do so in order that his now famous Amendment might not be defeated. Senator Johnson of California is not listed because he could not resist the temptation to vote for the Alameda Naval Base. It is notable that the majority of these Senators came from the South which, whatever its sins in other directions, is less infected with the virus of militarism than any other part of the country. It is encouraging to note that there is this group of "irreconcilables" on the disarmament question as there was formerly on the League of Nations question. It may be, in God's mercy, that this later group will be as successful in its fight as was the earlier group.

As I watch the American nation speeding gayly, with invincible optimism, down the road to destruction, I seem to be contemplating the greatest tragedy in the history of mankind.

Thus speaks Professor William McDougal, of Harvard, formerly of Oxford, social psychologist of

international fame and distinction, in his new book, "Is America Safe for Democracy." Professor McDougal is plainly appalled by what is going on, but his reasons for despair are not those ordinarily cited in discussions of this kind. The terror which haunts him lies in the results that are being shown by that very recent invention, the intelligence test. For the first time, we have positive information as to the mental and moral equipment of our people; and we discover that "we are a grammar school people, lacking the mental stamina to sustain even a high school education." Army tests of drafted men, the pick of the land, revealed the fact that only 4½ per cent of the men had "the ability to make a superior record in college"; only 9 per cent were "capable of making an average record in college"; 16½ per cent represented "low grade college material"; 25 per cent were men "rarely capable of finishing a high school course"; and no less than 45 per cent, all the remainder, were sub-normal or out-and-out defectives! Added to this appalling fact is the still more appalling fact that the upper grades of intelligence and morality are failing to reproduce themselves, while the lower grades are rapidly multiplying. If the present tendency continues, says Professor McDougal, men whose intelligence is high or even average, will "become as rare as white elephants, dropping to a mere fraction of 1 per cent." Professor McDougal has lost confidence in democracy. He sees no help in education. He finds a sole loophole of escape in the "increasing knowledge of human nature and human society" which, he declares, is "a new factor in history." We know, as no men before us have ever known, the impending character of our fate. Have we the will to master it?

Will Irwin's great book, "The Next War," has achieved its end of abolishing war and its attendant modern horrors, much more quickly than we had dared to suppose was possible. A single reading of the volume has led one critic, Mr. Wade Chance of the New York *Evening Post,* to point out that, in order to solve the whole question of armaments, wars and world-wide desolation, "we merely have to see that henceforth such instruments of destruction are no longer permitted in unworthy or treacherous hands, but intrusted only to the care of sound forces of civilization. . . . Peace in Europe demands that *Germany* must not have freedom to perfect and manufacture these new and horrible weapons which threaten whole nations." Now isn't that simple? Poisonous gases and the rest present no menace to mankind if "intrusted to the care of sound forces of civilization," i. e., France, England, the United States and (we wonder if he includes) Japan. These nations are utterly harmless; they have never fought any wars in the past, and can be counted upon never to fight any in the future. Germany is the only country which has ever destroyed the peace; if she be disarmed, the dream of all the ages of "peace on earth, goodwill to men," will at last be fulfilled. Which makes us wonder why peace has not come to Europe since Germany was beaten and stripped naked at Versailles! But we forget that there is always the danger that Germany, as clever as she is brutal, may arm in secret. "Since restrictions imposed can never be assured to a certainty," says our critic, "the Allied Powers must study the possibilities (of modern methods of war) and their prevention." Which makes us wonder again why the "sound forces of civilization" do not let loose against the Germans every weapon of destruction they control, wipe them out altogether like any other pest, and thus finish up the business for good and all! It might be mussy, to be sure—it's awkward turning 60,000,000 people into as many corpses at one stroke! But think of what would be gained—a world delivered from war forevermore! UNITY has always sought peace, and therefore is tempted to urge that this be done!

This is an interesting report which has come to us from England about Robert Bridges, the Poet Laureate! During the war Mr. Bridges was so outraged by the stories of mistreatment of English prisoners of war by their German captors, that he wrote a poem denouncing these atrocious violations of the covenant of nations. This poem can be found on page 39 in his last volume entitled, "October." Now comes a report that Mr. Bridges has repudiated his poem and offered full recantation of what he regards as a serious offense against the German people. He testifies that he is now satisfied that the stories which were told of the sufferings of English prisoners in Germany were false and his poem therefore a mistake! More and more, as time goes on and evidence accumulates, it becomes certain that comparatively few of the stories about the Germans that came to us during the war period were true. Of course we know that the Lusitania was sunk, that Edith Cavell was shot, that Capt. Fryatt was shot. We also know that the Germans applied more consistently perhaps than any other people the law of military necessity which was indulged in by all the combatants. But beyond these few facts, what can be accepted as true? We personally do not expect to live long enough to learn all the real facts about the Great War; but we have made up our minds to accept no generalizations, except that all nations were fighting to the death against defeat and conquest, and did everything possible, in violation of every principle of right and of every humanitarian ideal, to bring victory to their arms!

The triumph of passive resistance as a method of opposition to tyranny and repression, is demonstrated just as often as it is tried. For example, it will be remembered that in March, 1920, a *coup d'etat* was attempted in Germany. More than 5,000 troops were sent into Berlin by General Ludendorf, and an attempt made at re-establishing the old monarchical regime. The Ebert government quickly and quietly retired from the field and it was left to the public to offer resistance. This the people did, not by throwing up barricades and dying more miserably than gloriously in the gutter, but by organizing, as by preconceived agreement, a boycott against the military party. No sooner had the troops arrived than everybody went on strike—officials, professional men, clerks, office boys, laborers. Nobody would work, nobody would recognize the troops, nobody would do anything! In a few days the troops melted away, the Ebert government returned; and in the whole affair not a shot had been fired or a man killed. Another illustration comes to us this moment from Ireland. The establishment of the Home Rule Government in Ulster has led to an economic boycott of the province by the rest of Ireland. Nobody outside of Ulster will do business with the prescribed province. Traveling salesmen are returning from all parts of the country without orders; deposits in Ulster banks are being withdrawn right and left by the Irish people; newspapers are everywhere giving prominence to the slogan, "Boycott Belfast and kill petition." The result of this move has registered its first victory in the decision of Sir James Craig, the "Loyalist" Premier, to meet and talk with Mr. de Valera, a man whose very existence he was declining to recognize only a few days ago. Thus the old, old story all over again! There is nothing that can be done with people who will do nothing themselves. There is no need to take up arms and fight for anything in this world, either in aggression or defense. To fold one's hands, to be willing to suffer and to face death unafraid, means sooner or later the defeat and surrender of your enemy!

Dean Inge, in an article in the *Churchman,* is insistent that "the schisms of the present are not likely to be permanent." He states his belief that the Roman Catholic Church will undoubtedly always remain apart so long as it survives, and urges that modern Europe make no compromise with this vast hierarchy which at the best is "the true heir and continuation of the Mediterranean Empire of the Cæsars," and is therefore only "a splendid and most interesting survival." The rest of the religious world, however, says the Dean, must get together. "Whether we look at the history of the past," he declares, "or make forecasts of the future," we must still reach the same conclusion. Here is a prophetic declaration—hardly in keeping, we may say, with the reputation of a man who is popularly known as "the gloomy Dean"! His recent book, however, which caused such wide discussion in both England and this country, reveals a mind trained to hard, straight thinking, and not afraid of facts. This distinguished churchman sees clearly that Protestantism, as it is organized today, is doomed, and must therefore seek reconstruction on a foundation of which the cornerstone shall be unity. We wonder if he sees also that the substance of this foundation must be social? We believe that all attempts at Christian unity in the past have failed because of the failure of men to recognize that religion must be shifted from the theological to the social basis. The community movement, after all, has found the way out. Community religion may be regarded as marking that third period of Christian history of which Mediævalism and Protestantism are to be regarded respectively as the first and second.

The Pulitzer prizes have been given this year to Edith Wharton's "The Age of Innocence" as the best novel, to Edward Bok's "The Americanization of Edward Bok" as the best biography, and to our co-editor, Zona Gale's "Miss Lulu Bett" as the best play. Prizes of this kind only prove that many men are of many minds! Mrs. Wharton's book is a finished work of art, like all her writings, but it seems to us immeasurably inferior as a human document to Sinclair Lewis's "Main Street." Zona Gale's play is worthy of the highest recognition, but we cannot understand why the drama should be rewarded and the novel from which it sprang be ignored, as it is the latter and not the former which is the true masterpiece. As for Mr. Bok's story of his life, we consider that it is an important document to be classified with Mary Antin's "The Promised Land" and Abraham Rihbany's "A Far Journey," but we fail to see how it comes under the terms of the Pulitzer Endowment. Wherein does it compare, for example, from this point of view, with Joseph Bucklin Bishop's "Theodore Roosevelt and His Time." The best that can be said about these awards, perhaps, is that they are all of them worthy specimens of creative handiwork, and no one of them unworthy expressions of American life and spirit. Furthermore it must never be forgotten in matters of this kind, that each man or committee is entitled to its own opinion, and that a confession of dissent means only that other people also are entitled to their opinions.

"Forward!" cried one, "for us no beaten track,
No city continuing, no turning back:
The past we love not for its being past,
But for its hope and ardor forward cast."

—*Henry Newbolt.*

Duty to Civilization

VI.

Mr. Sidney B. Fay's articles on "The Origin of the War," in the *American Historical Review,* are excellent illustrations of the necessity of the historian proceeding with exceeding caution when examining the official documents relating to the outbreak of the war. Mr. Fay has no doubt set about his task with a clear mind and a wholesome desire to get at the truth, but he has accepted the Austrian Red Book and the Kautsky documents without sufficient scrutiny. He, however, is not to be blamed for jumping to the conclusion that Berchtold "more than anyone else was responsible for the world war." The Austrian Foreign Minister was undoubtedly obstinate, impulsive and suspicious, but the matter of determining the guilt of Berchtold is not so simple as it appears in Mr. Fay's analysis of the events and documents which he presents. For instance, he seems to consider the cause of the friction between Austria and Serbia to have arisen seriously for the first time at Serajevo, when the murder took place; and relying on the Austrian Red Book, he considers that the Wiesner report is conclusive, inasmuch as it considers "there is nothing to prove or even to cause suspicion of the Serbian Government's cognizance of steps leading to crime, or of its preparing it or of its supplying the weapons, etc." Now, Mr. Fay overlooks the probability of a perfectly honest investigator reporting no evidence of guilt in a case where evidence of guilt is abundant but not apparent at the time of the investigation. If Berchtold's guilt is determined by the Wiesner report, what is to be said now that we have clear proof that the murderers were Serbian military officers, that they were Pan-Slavists, and, moreover, that the enclosure which was sent with the Austrian note to Serbia was substantially correct?

The enclosure, containing a summary of the criminal proceedings taken against Princip, was submitted to every European Power with the Austrian note, not later than July 24th, 1914. Indeed Count Mensdorff described the nature of the note to Sir Edward Grey at the Foreign Office, London, July 23rd, according to dispatch No. 3 in the British White Paper, and, as I have already stated, the British Ambassador at Vienna telegraphed to Grey on the 16th of July what the character of the Austrian note to Serbia would be. Sir Edward Grey, therefore, knew the nature of the Austrian note six days before it was presented to the Serbian Government, but the first time he complained of the time limit in the note was, according to the British White Paper, after it had been delivered to Serbia. Moreover, it is strange how dispatch No. 38 in the British White Paper has been overlooked. It was sent by the British Ambassador from Rome, on July 23rd, but for reasons not explained it did not reach the British Foreign Office until July 27th. For an Ambassador to send information of such importance through the post was stupid, or, on the other hand, he did not consider the news about the Austrian note was worth the cost of a telegram. The dispatch says: "I gathered that the Italian Goverenment have been made cognizant of the terms of the communication, which will be addressed to Serbia." This means that the Italian Government was informed by Austria before the note was sent to Serbia.

There is little doubt that every Chancellery in Europe was informed of the resolution, for which Count Tisza was responsible, passed unanimously on July 19th, by the Austro-Hungarian Council, stating that the monarchy had no intention of annexing Serbia. What became of the notification of that resolution that was sent to the Powers, no one knows, but who can go through the diplomatic documents now on hand without believing that there was a conspiracy in Entente Foreign Offices to suppress the purport of that resolution. The Austrian note was presented July 24th. How the chauvinists of France, Russia, Italy, and later Great Britain, could stir up a war feeling against Austria by declaring it was Austria's intention to destroy Serbia and annex her territory, can only be explained by the suppression of the Vienna resolution, and that the Foreign Offices permitted the jingo press in their countries to make statements they knew to be untrue, is one of the features of this discreditable affair that makes decent-minded folk shudder at the work of the Chancelleries. Havas Laszlo says:

> "But what became of this resolution? As the *Pester Lloyd* rightly observes, how is it possible that on July 27th Sazonov (the Russian Foreign Minister) could still say to Count Pourtales, the German Ambassador, that Austria and Hungary want to "swallow Serbia"? And how is it that Pourtales did not answer by the resolution of the Vienna Council of July 19th? Is it conceivable that nobody knew of a declaration that was clearly intended to be known—not even Lord Grey? Whose interest was it that the conflict should not be localized, as it would have been by the acceptance of Tisza's demands? Russia and Germany have answered already; as to Rome, we may suppose that if it had taken into account the resolution of July 19th, it would no longer have had such a plausible excuse of exacting "compensations" in the Balkans. But a complete light will only come when the dark chambers of subterranean diplomacy are thrown open in Paris, London and Washington."

There was little doubt in the minds of persons familiar with the Balkans that Russia was backing Ser-

bia against Austria during the whole business. A glance at the English journals and illustrated papers will satisfy anyone that British opinion was on the whole sympathetic to Austria. Sir Owen Seaman's verses in *Punch* of August 5th reflect middle class opinion:

To Serbia:

"You have won whatever of fame it brings
To have murdered a king and the heir of kings,
And it well may be that your sovereign pride
Chafes at a touch of its tender hide;
But why should I follow your fighting line,
For a matter that's no concern of mine?"

and *John Bull's* cry, "To hell with Serbia," expresses faithfully the opinion of Clerkdom. He must indeed have been a man wholly ignorant of foreign affairs who did not understand that Russia was backing Serbia all along.

That Europe would be embroiled must have been obvious to all the members of the Entente as early as July 23rd, for Grey, in his dispatch to the British Ambassador at Vienna, says: "Great apprehension had been expressed to me *not specially by M. Cambon and Count Benckendorff,* but also by others, as to what might happen, and it had been represented to me that it would be very desirable that those who had influence in St. Petersburg should use it on behalf of patience and moderation." Further on in the same dispatch he remarks that Count Mensdorff, the Austrian Ambassador, said: "All would depend upon Russia."

From the date of the murder until the time of the publication of the Austrian note, British journals were unanimously opposed to Serbia. The change in opinion which came about on July 25th could not seriously be attributed to the stiff terms of the note. The warning editorial in the *Times* of that date, to the effect that "the danger of a conflagration is very serious to all the Powers," was prompted by its knowledge of the secret military and naval commitments of the Entente, and the special information that paper had of the policy of Russia. It was Russia that forced the issue. If any American leader of thought has any doubt of it, let him look through the files of the principal British journals. After the exchange of the notes some of the London and chief provincial dailies remained firm in their opposition to intervention by the Powers. Dr. E. J. Dillon's articles in the London *Daily Telegraph* described the situation accurately. On July 26th, commenting editorially on Dillon's articles, in which he complained that the diplomacy of the Entente Powers was "on an entirely wrong tack," the paper said:

> "Considerations of this kind prove how delicate and difficult the diplomatic action of the Triple Entente will be with regard to the crisis. Great Britain is by no means necessarily involved in the present Balkan trouble, but circumstances might easily arrive in which her sympathy with the two other partners of the Triple Entente might suggest the necessity of some kind of action. In this country we have no sympathy whatever with Serbia. We reprobate all the crimes which are associated with the Serbian military party. On general grounds we are inclined to believe that Austria-Hungary is justified in demanding full and prompt repudiation of all those nefarious schemes which have politics as their excuse and murder as their handmaid. Nor could we have a clearer exposition of the Austrian case than is contained in Mr. Dillon's dispatch from Vienna, which we publish this morning."

The *Manchester Guardian* said: "Russia's threat of war against Austria is a piece of sheer brutality," and declared, "on the whole, English newspapers have avoided taking sides in the quarrel," then it adds: "all with, we think, only one exception, have recognized the extreme provocation that Austria has received and her right to take the strongest measures to secure the punishment of all concerned in the assassination of the Crown Prince." Neither the terms of the Austrian note nor the Serbian reply to it was the cause of the electrifying change of opinion which began July 25th; it was brought about by Russia's action which involved Britain, France and Belgium in a quarrel started by members of the Pan-Slav movement in Austrian territory.

Let us now turn again to the diplomatic documents. No. 6 in the British White Paper, from the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg to Grey, is the basis of the opinion of those who said that if Grey had been in a position to declare publicly that Britain was secretly engaged with France and Russia and would fulfill her military and naval obligations, war would have been impossible. Stuck fast, however, between secret alliances he had not the courage to reveal to the House, and the sentiment in the country utterly opposed to war, he kept the people in the dark until he and they were lost. Woodrow Wilson was perfectly right, indeed he was only echoing European well informed opinion, when he said, March 5th, 1919: "We know for a certainty that if Germany had thought for a moment that Great Britain would go in with France or Russia, she would never have undertaken the enterprise." Mr. Bonar Law said practically the same thing in the House of Commons, June 18th, 1918: "It has been commonly said —and I think it is very likely true—that if Germany had known for certain that Great Britain would have taken part in this war, the war would never have occurred." It was Britain's participation declared publicly at the last moment which made it possible for the German Government to wage war. That dispatch from Buchanan, British Ambassador at St.

Petersburg, received by Grey on July 24th, is conclusive. The parts emphasized by Buchanan are as follows:

"He (Sazonov) hoped that His Majesty's Government would not fail to proclaim their solidarity with Russia and France."

"The French Ambassador gave me to understand that France would fulfill all the obligations entailed by her alliance with Russia."

"The general European question was involved, the Serbian question being but a part of the former, and that Great Britain could not afford to efface herself from the problems now at issue."

"M. Sazonov said that he thought that Russian mobilization would at any rate have been carried out."

"Our (Britain) only chance of averting war was for us to adopt a firm and united attitude."

"French Ambassador and M. Sazonov both continued to press me for a declaration of complete solidarity of His Majesty's Government with France and Russian Governments."

"An attack upon Austria by Serbia would endanger the whole peace of Europe."

"M. Sazonov answered we (Britain) sooner or later would be dragged into the war, if it did break out; we should have rendered war more likely if we did not from the outset make common cause with his country and with France."

This extraordinary dispatch was followed the next day by another, to Grey, in which Buchanan says: "He (Sazonov) did not believe that Germany really wanted war, but that her attitude was decided by ours (Britain). If we took our stand firmly with France and Russia, there would be no war, and if we fail them now, rivers of blood would flow, and we would in the end be dragged into the war."

Before replying to the Austrian note, Serbia ordered mobilization and retirement of the Government from Belgrade to Nish. If there were no other grounds for knowing Russia was supporting every action Serbia took in this matter, these would be sufficient to convince anyone. The Serbian note did not satisfy Austria; but it was not, however, that which determined Austrian action; it was the fact that Serbia had ordered mobilization and removed her Government to Nish before she replied to the Austrian note. Had Serbia not made these two provocative moves, Austria could not have had the slightest excuse for assuming a belligerent attitude to Serbia.

What procedure then was resorted to by the Entente Powers to avert war? War propagandists made great play with Grey's suggestion of a conference—a conference that France, Russia and Italy never seriously intended to bring about. The first reference to the suggestion is in dispatch No. 10, which Grey sent to the British Ambassador at Paris. The French Ambassador, Paul Cambon, would not consider it *till Russia had expressed some opinion or taken some action.* The suggestion is referred to again in dispatch No. 11 from Grey to the British Embassy in Berlin. In dispatch No. 18 from the British Ambassador in Berlin, Grey was advised that Germany "was quite ready to fall in with your suggestion, as to the four Powers working in favor of moderation at Vienna and St. Petersburg, if the relations between Austria and Russia became threatening." What use a conference would have been no one can surmise, for when Grey suggested it, the Austro-Serbian affair had ceased to be a local matter.

Russia began to mobilize on the 25th, and the preceding day the British fleet received an order to postpone demobilization. (See dispatch 66, French Yellow Book.) When Grey telegraphed to Buchanan at St. Petersburg July 27th, about the order not to demobilize the fleet, which was issued on the 24th, the fleet had sailed from Weymouth, "a welcome earnest of our intention to be ready for any course which the national interests may render desirable," as the *Times* said. What then was the good of Grey pushing his idea of a conference before France, Russia and Italy, when they had told him pretty plainly that the affair was now changed to Russo-Servia versus Austria, in which all the principal Powers were involved. Russia spurned any idea of a conference on July 27th, and when Austria declared war against Serbia, July 28th, the suggestion of a conference was "adopted" by Italy and France; but Russia had rejected the suggestion, and, on July 27th, Sazonov telegraphed to the Russian Ambassador at London that he had told Buchanan at Petersburg he had begun conversations with the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador under conditions which he hoped were favorable.

What historians of the future will say of the diplomatic documents time will tell, but I venture to state that the British White Paper (both editions of it) will be singled out of the lot as the fakiest bundle of dispatches ever published by a Foreign Office. Yet one can easily fill up the gaps and put the dates in order, now that so much is known of what really took place. On July 28th, Grey explained to the British Ambassador at Berlin that his suggested conference "would not be an arbitration but a private and informal discussion to ascertain what suggestion could be made for a settlement," and he adds "that a *direct exchange of views between Austria and Russia is the most preferable method of all.*" Then after learning that both Russia and Austria had agreed "to the most preferable method of all," a direct exchange

of views, he telegraphed to the British Ambassador at Berlin, as follows:

> "The German Government having accepted principle of mediation between Austria and Russia by the four Powers, if necessary I am ready to propose that the German Secretary of State should suggest the lines on which this principle should be applied. I will, however, keep the idea in reserve until I see how the conversations between Austria and Russia progress."

So, within four days, the little Austro-Serbian affair had become one in which all the great Powers of Europe were involved, and not one of Grey's allies showed the slightest desire to be a party to the suggested London conference; and Russian mobilization killed any chance of seeking a solution through the direct exchange of views between Russia and Austria.

On July 28th, all the interested Powers were rushing on to war, all save Germany and Italy, and on the night of the next day the German Chancellor realized in his conversation with Sir Edward Goschen, the British Ambassador, that the future was forbidding. In dispatch No. 85 the question of Belgian neutrality is raised for the first time, and then by the German Chancellor, who said: "It depends upon the action of France what operation Germany may be forced to enter upon in Belgium, but when the war was over, Belgian integrity would be respected, if she had not sided against Germany." This dispatch, No. 85, has all the appearance of being faked. What Sir Edward Goschen really communicated in it to the Foreign Office may never be learned, but no impartial student will accept it as it stands. It served its purpose well, however, for Asquith and Grey used it with great effect in bolstering up their case before the House of Commons. This dispatch No. 85 is misplaced so intentionally that it is worth while plodding through the rather intricate analysis of what took place in the dispatching business on July 29th, that I have presented in "How Diplomats Make War." There it will be seen that Grey did not warn the German Ambassador at London that he must not be misled by the friendly tone of their conversation into thinking that Britain would stand aside, until several hours after he had told Paul Cambon, the French Ambassador. Moreover, Grey had telegraphed to the British Ambassador at Paris about the warning several hours before he warned the German Ambassador. Grey persevered with his wretched secret methods to the bitter end. The result was that Paul Cambon's brother, Jules, the French Ambassador at Berlin, was able to wire to Paris on the afternoon of July 29th, that:

> "The attitude of the Chancellor (German) is very probably the result of the last interview of Sir Edward Grey with Prince Lichnowsky. Up to quite the last days they flattered themselves here (Berlin) that England would remain out of the question, and the impression produced on the German Government and on the financiers and business men by her attitude is profound." (French Yellow Book No. 92.)

This bit of trickery is rather unique, even in the records of diplomacy inaugurated by Delcassé, Isvolsky and Grey. It amounts to this—that the French Ambassador at Berlin knew all about the warning that was to be given to Lichnowsky in London before the German Government knew anything about it. How anything but war would result from the procedure adopted by Grey is difficult to imagine, still I do believe he was under the impression until the last that he could avert a catastrophe by postponing a public declaration of his secret commitments to France and Russia. He was fighting for time, when really every hour of postponement was making matters worse for him. Presumably he kept saying to himself: "I have not committed myself publicly, I am not publicly bound to France and Russia —my hands are quite free, so far as public policy is concerned, and if I only wait long enough these complicated questions will solve themselves, and all the armies and navies that have been gathering for the prospective fray will be demobilized, and nothing worse than another armed peace will be the consequence."

(To be continued.)

DUSK.

The red sun dips. Long shadows grow
To one rich gloom as homeward go
The scuttling hares; whose white tails gash
The dark green banks where by they flash.
Old neighbor horse lends his rough tongue
And licks a dozing mare. Nigh sung
Is the last lullaby of birds—
A dreamy song of nonsense-words.

And sleepily I seek my home,
Who ask from day's distemper some
Dear refuge at the dusk of night,
Still haven from harsh seas of light . . .
Tired senses all to sleep are curled,
Their doors fast shut upon the world:
And friendly stars like tapers shine
With guardian light on me and mine.

Westminster Gazette, London. —*Anonymous.*

The prophet is the summed-up soul and conscience of a community, the emblem and the fountain of its moral life. He derives nothing from convention; he speaks out of his own strength and originality of nature, with the vehemence, and even anger, of great convictions and with an amplitude of utterance which scorns details in its passion for principles. It is, above all things, his business to see; then to speak of what he sees with unfaltering sincerity, addressing himself to his fellows in such a way as to reveal to them their own deficiencies; finally to inspire in them a desire of reformation and of all noble progress and accomplishment.—*William J. Dawson.*

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

V.

RICHARD WAGNER.

Wilhelm Richard Wagner, 1813-1883, was one of the greatest of all music composers, and expressed an unrivalled genius by means of his music-dramas. Throughout his life he was a revolutionist, largely in the interests of art. The one passion of his life was that of giving art a position of the first importance in the concerns of the people. He was in this behalf a democrat, a communist and an uncompromising radical. He was in active revolt against artificiality, the conventional, and conservatism of every kind. Because of this revolutionary tendency, he met with every manner of opposition to his ideas and to his reforms; and only in the last decade of his life did success come to him worthy of his genius and his accomplishment. His is today a position of the greatest importance in the history of art, and that of one who has conquered the world to recognition of his radical demands for change and advance.

George Bernard Shaw has written of the pre-eminence of Wagner as a musician, and says that in this regard he reached the summit of nineteenth century dramatic music. Henry T. Finck asserts that from a purely dramatic point of view, Wagner is the greatest poet Germany has produced, and adds: Wagner's greatest poetic merit was in the fact that he introduced an entirely new world on the operatic stage —not only new forms, but new subjects, new atmospheric effects, new charms of local color; in place of worn-out plots that have often done service in romances, plays, operas and burlesques. Arthur Symons says that in Wagner the musician, the poet, the playwright, the thinker, the administrator, all worked to a single end, without waste of a faculty, without any faculty being sacrificed to another; and that in this he is unique as a man of genius. Kuno Francke tells us that it is to Wagner that German literature owes the most emphatic proclamation of the artistic ideal of the future. Hans von Wolzogen is impressed with the fact that Wagner out of the simplest motives builds the wonderful structure of a work of flowing, glowing, charming musical life. James Huneker asserts that we adore Wagner because he moves us, thrills us, and thralls us. His may not be the most spiritual art, but it is the most completely fascinating.

No words can describe too strongly the hindrances, the oppositions, and the discords of many kinds which beset the life of Wagner. Undoubtedly these had the effect on him to distrust, and even to detest, the conditions of modern civilization. In this respect he was a pessimist, and was made all the more so by his acceptance of the philosophy of Schopenhauer. Here was in no small degree the cause of his revolutionary tendencies. He took part at Dresden, where he was a leader at the court theatre, in the revolutionary movement of 1849, which was suppressed by Prussian soldiers. Roeckel and Bakunin were condemned to death, and Roeckel was in prison thirteen years, while Bakunin, being transferred to Russia, was sent to Siberia, from where he escaped to England. Wagner fled, and was in exile in Switzerland and Paris for twelve years before he was permitted again to return to Germany.

Wagner was not actively a political revolutionist. In so far as he was so at all, it was in behalf of art. He saw clearly that the then existing conditions, in the court, in the economic situation, in the sordid and debased tone of society generally, were not favorable for the theatre, for drama, for music, for art in any form. There was no promise for what is wholesome and elevating. He studied thoroughly the art of Athens, and thought he saw there a communal activity which explains the superiority of its poetry and its drama, as well as the great influence of its theater on the life of the people. He also zealously investigated the Teutonic age of the sagas and the great myths, and found there again an active co-operation of the community in the production of such works as Nibelungen-lied. These studies, in connection with his interest in socialism, led him to the conclusion that the reason why Greek art degenerated, and why the great age of Teutonic creativeness no longer continued, was to be found in the development of individualism, and a consequent debasement of the moral life of the people.

During the early years of his exile in Switzerland Wagner was debarred from active expression of himself in music, and he turned his attention to musical theory, and the relations of the several arts to each other. Assuming that art demands communal conditions for its effective production, he wrote a series of essays expounding his theories. These works included "Art and Revolution," 1849; "Art-work of the Future" (*Kunstwerk der Zukunft*), 1850; "Opera and Drama," and "A Communication to My Friends," 1851; "Future of Music," 1860; "State and Religion" (*Ueber Staat und Religion*), 1864. Some of these works were mere pamphlets, while others extended to bulky volumes. "Opera and Drama," in its original edition, appeared in three volumes.

Before the revolutionary period Wagner had composed a number of operas along conventional lines. These included "The Fairies," "Rienzi," "Flying Dutchman," "Tannhauser," and "Lohengrin." He had already begun to work out a broader conception of art. The effect of the revolution was to develop ideas derived from the great composers who had preceded him, such poets as Goethe and Schiller, and the influences coming from the philosophers Hegel, Feuerbach, and Schopenhauer. Perhaps his basic idea was that of the degeneration of art and civilization under modern conditions of individualism, money-getting, demand for luxury and amusement, and a consequent deterioration of society in all directions. This conclusion, of course, was thoroughly pessimistic, not based on sound historical conclusions, and not justified by the facts of man's evolution.

In his prose writings already mentioned Wagner sought to bring art back to what was natural, ethical, and religious, by a recovery of something of the old communal or co-operative spirit, which had made art great in the early times. First of all it was necessary that there should be a fellowship among artists that would enable them to co-operate as a community in the production of art works. In this way he sought the reform of the theatre, in order that it might have a social and ethical effect on the lives of the people generally. This idea developed into the conception

of the community of the arts, that the degeneration of art had come about, in part at least, because the arts had been separated from each other. He sought to bring music and poetry again into union with each other, and to this end became a poet, writing the poems for which he produced his musical compositions. In his "Opera and Drama" he fully elaborated this idea, showing that dance was the first of the arts to appear, how there was added to it song, how these expanded into poetry and music, and then, finally, how all these were more or less fully combined in early drama. This community of the arts had in modern times, especially in Italy, degenerated into opera, with its opportunities for the display of individual talents. Music had lost its power, and it had become merely the means for entertainment of jaded workers and the debauched seekers for the amusement of idle hours.

These ideas led Wagner to devise his theory of what was called "the music of the future," or what he himself described as music-drama. This was an attempt to unite all the arts in an adequate and inspiring interpretation of life in all its phases, in the wholeness of its manifestations. Wagner would bring together again dance, song, poetry, instrumental music, painting, sculpture, and architecture in one unified appeal to the deepest and noblest in human life. Music-drama demanded a special kind of architecture, with its accessories of painting and sculpture, to house the people, to allow of ample scenic and orchestral presentations, to provide for those illusions of the senses desirable for dramatic effects. The drama itself must not only include dance, song, an orchestra, elaborated music and poetry; but it must grow out of those myths and sagas of the great communal era, in which the people had expressed themselves in that early age of loyalty and creativeness. Already in "Tannhauser" and "Lohengrin" Wagner had made use of these bold productions of the olden time. In his essays, developing his theory of music-drama, he constantly used the words "folk," "community," or "communism," and the ideas they represent are essential to his revolutionary conceptions of art as an interpretation of the wholeness of human experience. In his later musical works, "Tristan and Isolde," 1857; "Meistersinger," 1862; "Siegfried," 1865; "The Twilight of the Gods" (*Gotterdammerung*), 1870, and "Parsifal," 1877, Wagner worked out his theories as to the community of the arts. The myths on which were based these music-dramas, it is to be remembered, were the creations, as he thought, of the primitive Teutonic communities when men lived a thoroughly communal life.

Almost from the beginning of his production of his operas, and then of his music-dramas, Wagner had been seeking for a reform of the theatre. He was convinced that it might be made a great ethical and religious influence in the lives of the people, a true educator, and a force developing the higher civilization. His theories were criticized, laughed at, caricatured, and in every possible manner opposed. This opposition was such that for many years Wagner found no opportunity for the carrying out of his theories into practical expression, no means of giving them full expansion, or even of securing recognition of the significance of his music-dramas and his theories in any effective manner. During the early years of his exile, therefore, his work as a composer was in abeyance, he became utterly discouraged for a time, and thought of suicide. Poverty, the distrust and the opposition of his wife, failure to secure effective recognition for his work, criticism of his theories, inability to apprehend his genius, all combined to keep the public from giving him the support he needed. Individuals had faith in him; but the public generally, and the leaders of opinion, seemed determined that he should not be heard. At last, however, his persistent fidelity to his own genius, in spite of every obstacle, won for him what he had desired, an opportunity to produce his music-dramas under the conditions he regarded as essential.

With the aid of the King of Bavaria, in 1876, Wagner was enabled to have built at Bayreuth, a small city of that German State, the kind of theatre or music-festival house, he felt to be required for the production of his music-dramas in a manner to make for them a great appeal upon the public. In the summer of that year there was produced at the Bayreuth theater the Ring of the Nibelung, followed in later years by his own productions. Bayreuth drew large audiences, received world-wide recognition, and crowned with the highest degree of success the work and the genius of Wagner. Criticism of his theories and his dramas, however, has never ceased; and there are not wanting those now who find cause for dissent or rejection. In spite of these dissenters, he has come to hold a foremost place as a thinker, poet, musician, and dramatist. His genius, his originality, his creative skill have come to be recognized even by those who criticize; and he has been accepted as one of the foremost of modern men. Musicians are often indifferent to his theoretical works, his revolutionary tendencies are ignored or scorned, while his ethical principles are often disregarded. In all these directions he is worthy of the largest measure of recognition, not only as the convictions of a man who won success against the most formidable obstacles, but as those of a man who gave to art a broader, a deeper, and a truer significance in connection with the evolution of civilization.

Wagner was not a philosopher, but he attempted to find the larger meanings of art in connection with the philosophical tendencies of his time. Art was for him basic to life itself, the true interpreter of feeling and emotion, the true voice of the inner life of man. Wagner was not a theologian, but he regarded religion as fundamental to every phase of civilization. In art he found its truest expression, its most worthy interpretation. In fact, it may be truly said, that to him art was religion, and the most genuine form in which religion seeks to manifest itself. In this sense Wagner conceived of religion as a manifestation of what life means and is; but he regarded the priest and the church as hindrances to religion, as misinterpreters of its true purposes and spirit. He did not accept Christianity in any of its dogmatic and sectarian interpretations; and he saw much in Brahmanism and Buddhism which he accepted with appreciation. He often used the phrases of theology, but with a meaning of his own. He saw in the degeneration of society what he thought was the true meaning of the doctrine of the fall of man; and he gave an ethical meaning to the dogma of regeneration or redemption. For him these dogmas had a social significance, and not one that was in any true sense theological.

In making use of the communal creations developed in the early Christian myths and sagas, such as those of the Holy Grail cycle, Wagner retained the symbolisms and poetic forms in which they were embodied; but he gave a fresh meaning to their ethical and esthetical significance. He did not quarrel with the poetry, but he did not accept the theology. This fact has been missed by some of his interpreters and critics, who have assumed that he was a Christian in the mediæval sense; but this is to misconceive the whole intent and purpose of Wagner in making use of the myths and sagas. Christianity is poetry and it is life. It is a feeling and not dogma, an ethical purpose and not theology. Above all, it is fellowship, a community of life, a comradeship in ethical purpose. To live for self, to secure personal advantage in an individualistic manner, is to degrade society and is to corrupt religion. At the same time all art degenerates, civilization is corrupted, and man becomes vile. Such was the theory of Richard Wagner. In large degree he was right, and on every hand we see today evidences that what he wrote has in it a large measure of truth. We need now precisely that kind of reform and revolution he sought for in 1849. GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

Justice in the United States!

We submit herewith for the instruction of our readers, the stories of three men convicted in the so-called Chicago I. W. W. case, who are now in Leavenworth prison. This case, it will be remembered, involved no less than one hundred and sixty-five men, who were arrested on a blanket indictment and tried at a single trial. This trial lasted five months and involved the presentation of more than ten thousand alleged criminal acts. It was inevitable, of course, that data against one man should appear prejudicial to all. The jury deliberated hardly long enough to read the defendants' names, and brought in a sweeping verdict of guilty.

Under these circumstances gross injustice was done to many of the defendants. Instances of these are presented herewith in the cases of Charles Ashleigh, Vincent St. John and Jack Law, each of whom is now serving a ten-year sentence. St. John was not a member of the I. W. W., and for three years prior to his arrest was prospecting in Arizona and New Mexico. Neither Law nor Ashleigh was active for long periods prior to their arrests. An open letter to President Wilson from Alexander Sidney Lanier, late Captain of the Military Intelligence Division of the General Staff of the United States Army, characterizes the conviction of the three men and their associates as "contrary to the law and evidence . . . the verdict rendered was a foregone conclusion, in obedience to public hysteria"; and more particularly of the cases of St. John and Ashleigh, asserts that these constitute "a gross miscarriage of justice and an outrage that every consideration of right, and the peace, and good order of society, demands should be corrected."

Persons interested in these cases should correspond with the Workers Defense Union, 7 East 15th Street, New York.

The data in the three cases cited, follow:

(1)—CHARLES ASHLEIGH

Ashleigh is a young literary man of excellent education who was employed as publicity agent by the Industrial Workers of the World during a great labor trial in the Northwest. At the conclusion of the trial, which ended in acquittal, he went to San Francisco and obtained a position on a daily newspaper. This was just at the time when the United States entered the war.

Much to his astonishment, he discovered that he had been indicted together with about a hundred members of the Industrial Workers of the World in the case of U. S. vs. William D. Haywood et al., although he had participated in no activities whatever against the prosecution of the war, and had registered and in every way complied with the laws of war time. As soon as he heard of his indictment, he surrendered to the authorities. He was taken to Chicago for trial, and after he had spent seven months in jail, he was tried and sentenced to ten years' imprisonment in the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kansas.

During the trial not a scintilla of evidence was offered against Ashleigh to prove that he had, in any way, violated the war laws. The mere fact of his early connection with the Industrial Workers of the World appeared to be sufficient to condemn him.

Charles Ashleigh has spent nearly two years in the Federal penitentiary, as well as seven months in a county jail, where his health was seriously impaired. He still must serve many years before his ten-year sentence is completed.

(2)—VINCENT ST. JOHN.

Vincent St. John was arrested on October 31st, 1917, at Jiracilla, New Mexico, where he was working and directing the Lincoln Exploration and Mining Company. His connection with the Industrial Workers of the World ended on his leaving the office of general secretary-treasurer on January 1st, 1915, as on that date he became a self-employer and ceased to be eligible, membership being limited to wage workers only. On leaving the office of secretary, he interested some friends in a prospecting project, and in July, 1915, he went to Jicarilla, Lincoln County, New Mexico, and took up the work of developing a copper property there. He worked continuously on this property from that date until the date of his arrest, October 31st, 1917, with the exception of a trip to the Colorado Tungsten fields at Boulder, Colorado, in May, 1916, and a trip to attend a stockholders' meeting at Chicago, Illinois, in July, 1917. While in Chicago at this time he called on the Industrial Workers of the World's office to visit friends there and for no other purpose. Nothing was introduced in evidence on the trial to the contrary. All correspondence between himself and members during this period was purely of a personal nature, as the record in the case will show. He was offered employment as an organizer among the miners, but refused to undertake the work.

No evidence of any kind was introduced to show that he was ever consulted as to policies of the Industrial Workers of the World or that he had ever offered any advice to the organization as to its policy during the time complained of by the indictment, or at any other time since his membership ended on the first day of January, 1915.

He is sentenced to ten years, of which he has served eight months, was five months in county jails.

(3)—JACK LAW

The Government absolutely failed to introduce any evidence connecting him with any act or word further-

ing any conspiracy or that he had any knowledge of any conspiracy.

He was arrested in Charleroi, Pennsylvania, on about October 5, 1917, and released on Ten Thousand Dollars bail before trial. After sentence he was taken to Leavenworth, Kansas, confined for one year and three weeks. Released on Ten Thousand Dollars bail, pending appeal. He was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment.

He was born in Boston, Pennsylvania. His ancestors were all American-born as far back as Revolutionary days. His father was born in England. Three months before his birth his father was killed in a mine accident. His mother died two weeks after his birth. He was raised in the mining region of Western Pennsylvania, went to school until he was eleven years old, then to work in the Ellsworth Coal Mine, Westmoreland County, and worked in different mines until he was sixteen years of age. Then he worked on the Cunneson Tunnel Irrigation Project in Colorado, the Shoshone Power Project at Glen Falls, Colorado, and later in the oil fields of California. He joined the Industrial Workers of the World in February, 1912, at San Diego, California, and held office as Branch Secretary for three months at Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1913. He was a voluntary organizer for six months in 1914, but left the Industrial Workers of the World in 1915. Worked for the Jewel Tea Company of Chicago, Illinois, as solicitor and was promoted to crew manager. Later on he worked for the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea & Coffee Company as field manager until the fall of 1916. When arrested, he was employed by the Eureka Specialty Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as salesman.

His only connection with the Industrial Workers of the World since 1915, previous to his arrest was to act as chairman for a mass meeting, organized by the Industrial Workers of the World. He signed his name to an application at that meeting, to help them obtain a charter, and contributed fifty cents. He does not know when or how he was elected as a trustee of the Pittsburgh Local, nor did he consent to such an election; nor how he appeared in the book of the Pittsburgh Local.

Since his release he has been continuously employed, first as auditor and supervisor for the Tri-State Wholesale Grocery Association, Inc., of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, later as general manager for the Consumers Co-operative Association of Jersey City, New Jersey. J. H. H.

SELECTED

Georgia Saves Her Reputation

AN EYE-WITNESS'S IMPRESSION OF THE PEONAGE MURDER TRIAL.

The trial scene lacks much in the staging. The room is crowded with witnesses, lawyers and spectators hopelessly mixed in. If you want to find the jury you look for twelve men sitting on chairs, and conspicuous because no one is sitting on their laps or climbing over them, nor crowding in between. Judge Hutcheson is not so fortunate; the sanctity of his bench is being shared with the townsfolk and neighbors. During a tilt between the opposing counsel the Judge leaned forward to listen more attentively, and on one side of him a barefooted urchin, on the other an old man, leaned forward, unconsciously assuming the same attitude. When his honor wants to make any notes he absentmindedly pushes one of his compeers aside for the time being.

The defendant on trial for murder and the members of his family are simply part of the indiscriminate crowd. Overhead there is a dimly lighted gallery, where the occasional flash of white teeth or eyeballs calls attention to the few black faces that blend into the darker background. The white men below occasionally glance up at this gallery. I overheard the remark: "Those damn Niggers oughta be out workin'!"

Before the verdict was brought in I made a survey of Covington opinion about the case. I talked with the barber, an automobile salesman, an agricultural county agent, a deputy sheriff, some farmers, the educational county supervisor, a lawyer, a school teacher, and so forth. They all agreed that Williams undoubtedly killed or helped to kill the Negroes, and though some of them deplored this, even these were more concerned with the fear that if Williams should be found guilty the "Niggahs would get out of hand." The average white man's attitude was, "Sure he killed 'em, an' what of it?" Some would have had him acquitted simply because a Negro accused him. One young farmer went so far as to remark, "Well, I hope they turn that black ——— loose; he won't get one hundred yards from the jail."

Among local groups discussing the case I heard several times this same expression of regret: "Williams oughta have killed just one more Niggah."

In a Northern court Williams would probably have been found guilty of murder and paid the death penalty, but the life sentence was all any jury would be courageous enough to impose in the Black Belt, and already the good news has gone forth that the next Governor will pardon him. Williams went too far. (Not because the muddy yellow river and the red hills of Georgia gave up eleven mutilated bodies, for what's a niggah, more or less?) But Williams ought to have shown better judgment in the time and quantity of his killings. To clear the good name of Georgia he must be sent up.

The whole situation was summed up in the last words of his counsel: "I know you are not going to send John Williams to the gallows on the story of this lying Niggah. I ask you, for the sake of his past, for the sake of his wife, for the sake of his children, throw over him the mantle of Christian charity. Whatever mistakes he may have made will never be repeated. You know it. This curious prosecution will teach him a lesson he will never forget."

The Liberator. —*Esau Jones.*

"Thou art not Death!" I cried;—
For Life's supremest fantasy
Had never thus envisaged Death to me;—
"Thou art not Death, the End!"

In accents winning,
Comes the answer,—"Friend,
There is no Death!
I am the Beginning,
—Not the End!"

—*John Oxenham.*

CORRESPONDENCE

An Open Letter to a Slacker

Mr. Grover Cleveland Bergdoll,
Hotel zur Krone, Eberbach, Germany.

My Dear Sir:

There has recently come to my attention an article published conspicuously by the *Chicago Tribune* and, I dare say, by numerous other American newspapers, containing what purports to be an interview with you by the Berlin correspondent of the Chicago paper, in which you are reported to have explained your recent activities by declaring that you were "a conscientious objector and not a slacker." I do not know, of course, whether you ever said this or whether it originated in the sardonic phantasy of a Chicago journalist. But if you really did venture to make a declaration of this kind, I have something to say to you.

Your actions during the war and since have been such that no one could possibly number you among the thousands of young men of our generation who, however thoughtlessly, surrendered body and soul to an exalted and generous, if sometimes blind, patriotic impulse and gave themselves eagerly to their country, or allowed themselves to be conscripted into its military service, without protest or adequate reward, believing that it had been compelled to wage a defensive war against an aggressive militarism and that its purposes in that war were unselfish, humane and just. The fact that a large number of young men in the former enemy countries believed and acted in an exactly similar fashion only serves to emphasize the fact that you were not one of those men. Instead you remained at home in the enjoyment of that privileged position which inherited wealth had given you, and when, after the war was over, you became entangled in the processes of the law, and were deprived of your liberty by reason of conviction of desertion, you resorted to admitted bribery and corruption to gain your freedom and fled to Germany as a fugitive from justice, leaving your mother and brother, and the advisers whom your money, or theirs, had retained to face the humiliation and pay the penalty consequent upon your namelessly dishonorable conduct.

In attempted justification of your extraordinary behavior, you are now reported to have announced yourself publicly as a conscientious objector to war, and I feel compelled, as one who, among others, paid the full penalty demanded by the American Government for reasoned and uncompromising refusal to participate directly or indirectly in the human butchery of the recent disastrous and unnecessary war, and as one who speaks therefore with some acquaintance with the intellectual or moral insight and conviction upon which such conscientious objection was based, to make it as plain as words can make it, that there is absolutely nothing in the sum total of your ideas, or in any of your actions, so far as I have been able to understand or follow them, to give you any smallest warrant to identify yourself with the men in various countries who voluntarily went to prison rather than cowardly or hypocritically submit to what they firmly believed was a fundamentally immoral coercion of the State, in order that, by so doing, they might register with their lives, if need be, the sacred and growing protest of the intelligent youth of the world against the devouring bestiality, the atavism, the insult and the lie of international war.

There were many who went to prison in the United States because of their hatred of war, who were not recognized as conscientious objectors, and conspicuously among these were several score of members of an international labor union known as the "Industrial Workers of the World," for whom, if you ever heard of them, you probably share the ignorant and cruel prejudices of most Americans possessing incomes of more than $1,000 a year, but who are, in deed and in truth, far more sincere and valiant champions of international justice and peace than you ever dreamed of being, and who, because of the ignorance and cruelty of which I have spoken, are still confined in the federal prison at Leavenworth, Kansas, where I hope your brother, who is being detained at present in that palace of knavery and degradation maintained by our government, will, for his own education and moral welfare, have the good fortune to make their acquaintance.

Not only did you do nothing throughout the war either to earn the reward of a soldier, who under the influence of a patriotic upheaval did what social and legal coercion made him call his duty, or to merit the title, by doing the thinking and enduring the sufferings, of a conscientious objector to war, but you are now in Germany, a known fugitive from justice, living in easy indolence upon American money that you have never earned among a defeated and humiliated people thousands of whom, helpless and hopeless as a result of the deadly attrition and overwhelming tragedy of the war, are slowly dying physically and spiritually of hunger and despair. You are, moreover, exhibiting in a foreign and unhappy land the most discreditable selfishness, the most callous and complete indifference to the social obligations which the enjoyment of wealth entails—the kind of thing which in less harrowing times than ours has earned for other Americans the just contempt of cultivated Europeans. You are, I venture to say, in every real sense the poorest American in Europe today.

War is the offspring of greed, the parent of intolerance, the sum of all anarchies and cruelties, "the grave of all good," but it has the singular merit of revealing the souls of men naked to the world, and it will never be abolished, or even diminished by men of your caliber, or lack of it. Second only to those pathetic creatures who preach the duty of hatred from so-called Christian pulpits and ethical platforms, and to those who subsidize them with pious hypocrisy and exhort their subordinates or followers to organized murder, while themselves remaining comfortably at home to coin the blood of the world's credulous youth into unholy gold—the men whom Jesus stigmatized "ye generation of vipers"—second only to those in the injury and disservice which they do the race are those who, having within them the ability to distinguish between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, fail, for want of courage, to defy and confound the destroyers and malefactors of mankind in the accents of truth, and abandon the post to which circumstances call them for some ignoble kennel until the battle is won by others for them, or lost forever.

If you were one of these, as I regret to be obliged to think that you were, the least penance now open to you is to devote a large portion of your income to feeding the starving children of Germany among whom you are living, and whom the war has deprived

A FREE CHURCH.

In reply to a series of communications from the office of the Pittsburgh Employers' Association, designed to persuade influential business men to withhold financial support from certain Christian organizations because ministers failed to keep within a "neutral zone" in sermons and other addresses, the Pittsburgh Ministerial Union has adopted resolutions expressing resentment against the attempt to dictate to the pulpit. The resolutions, presented by the Rev. Dr. F. R. Johnston, follow in part:

"Whereas, the Secretary of the Pittsburgh Employers' Association has issued communications with the purpose of dissuading men from furnishing financial support to certain Christian organizations because ministers have not limited their message to a so-called 'neutral zone'; and,

"Whereas, this involves the dictation to religious bodies as to what fields of thought and human service they may enter.

"Whereas, the Church, whenever true to its mission, has zealously guarded its absolute freedom to proclaim the full Gospel of Jesus Christ, without dictation from any external authority; and,

"Whereas, the Pittsburgh Employers' Association represents itself as speaking for the employing group—an assumption which we are convinced is contrary to fact;

"Resolved, That we, the Pittsburgh Ministerial Union, resent this attempt of a commercial organization to prescribe limits within which alone the Church and other religious organizations may move; that we reaffirm the historic right and the duty of the Church to proclaim the whole truth in Christ as revealed in the Scriptures and as applied under the Holp Spirit to every relationship in life; that we deny to any political, commercial, industrial, or any other group or agency the right to set any restrictions on the freedom of the Christian Church or its agencies to apply the spirit and standards of the Kingdom of God to the whole of life; that we declare it our solemn duty and purpose to defend this liberty of the Gospel."

In spite of the fact that so many children stay out of school and work, actual poverty is not the important factor in the majority of cases. As a beet grower in Colorado said to a representative of the Child Labor Committee staff, "My boy is worth $1,000 for work during the beet season, but is nothing but an expense when he goes to school." "The failure lies as much with the school as with the parents or the children," says Mr. Lovejoy. "To the parent, in many instances, the work of the school appears unpractical and unimportant; to the child it is often monotonous and irksome. Until we provide rural schools which are attractive in appearance, well equipped, well taught and vital to the life of the community, neither the rural school attendance nor the rural child labor problem will be solved."—*Bulletin National Child Labor Comm.*

---

of their birthright of health and happiness, and an equal sum to the release of the political prisoners in the United States who did not desert their informed convictions in time of danger and popular hysteria, thereby doing what you are able to redeem your own soul and that of your country. If you care to know through what agencies either or both of these good causes may be most successfully advanced, I shall be glad to provide you with the information. I am, sir,

Very sincerely yours,

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Pacifism

To the Editor:

While recognizing that the editorial policy of UNITY is for pacifism, I know that it also stands for free speech, so I venture to send some reasons why I believe pacifism is wrong in theory, impracticable for this world, and contrary to the best instincts of nature.

A pacifist can be defined as a warrior in the realm of feelings and intellect who fights hard against all other kinds of fighting but his own. He is as a rule superior to and more conscientious than the majority of mankind, but when once exposed to the germ of pacifism, he believes it to be a *sine qua non* that solves all problems, heals all diseases, and if allowed to work would save all men. This theory ignores the different ways of arriving at the same place, saying in effect that unless you take my way, you are not on the way. But life itself breaks all infallible rules, and all perfect circles, for life is larger than any rule, and the arrival at a city shows that there are many different ways to Rome. Beware of the man who says that my way is the only way, and all others are thieves and robbers. Pacifism has the impudence of ignorance exemplified in the history of many religions of the past of claiming the universal.

All bloodshed is not necessarily wicked. A surgeon in shedding blood may be moved by the highest of altruistic motives, and a nation like the United States may go to war with Spain for the purpose of cutting out the cancer of Spanish imperialism, and giving Cuba its freedom. Nations may in the end be judged as individuals; and the pacifist is right in stressing this point, but we confine criminals, control children, and lock our doors at night, generally. Some nations are like children, some like criminals, and some wish to take the property of others or retain the property of others against their will. In history all wars have not been wrong. Sherman's famous *bon mot* that "War is Hell" is a gross misstatement if it refers to all wars. Our war for independence contributed to the well being of the world, as well as the development of our nation, in which we have such excellent papers as UNITY, and free preachers as Holmes. The revolutionary wars of the South American Republics, are they not working out for the benefit of all? Would we want Spain to continue to put her hands itching for gold over this new continent until she would heed the preaching of pacifism? The civil war was good, not only for the Negro, finding him "a nigger" and giving him an opportunity to be a man, but it was a blessing in disguise for the white gentlemen of the South, many of whom have a chance to work a little. Has not history proved, from the days of William the Silent, that some wars are, from the pragmatic standpoint, good?

And pacifism at all times is contrary to the best instincts of our nature. When a drunken man comes along beating a child, and a pacifist can refrain, if he has the power of using physical force, to stop the brute, is he not trampling on one of the best instincts of himself? I believe in God, but if there is no personal God, I believe the student of history must agree that there is something in matter, taking the materialistic hypothesis, that urges mankind upward and onward. As the centuries roll round and man makes his spiral way toward perfection, the conscientious militarist like Joshua of the Old Testament, and the incomparable pacifist, Jesus of the New, each adds his contribution to our common wealth of progress.

All great pacifists have been great fighters. But why is force physical used for good ends "Taboo"? and force of intellect used for good ends, the only just way? Is there not something back of physical and intellectual forces which the militant miltarist, and the fighting pacifist, acknowledge in their saner moments, to be good or evil?

CARLYLE SUMMERBELL.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- - - -